

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,240,521 (hereinafter “Barber et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,108,663 (hereinafter “Kabelshkov”).

The examiner rejected also claims 20 and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabelshkov, Barber et al., Chen et al., and Ditzik as applied to claims 1 and 3-9, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,497,021 (hereinafter “Fukuda et al.”)

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) ¶ 2143.03).

Independent claims 1, 10, and 20 of the present application include limitations not disclosed or taught by Barber, Kabelshkov, Chen et al., or Ditzik. As a result, claims 1, 10, and 20 are patentable over Barber, Kabelshkov, Chen et al., and Ditzik (hereinafter referred to as “the References.”

In particular, applicant’s claims, as amended, include the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

transitioning a central processing~~or~~ unit (CPU) of a computer system into a low power mode, the system having a memory, a disk drive unit, and a shared database, the database to store at least a partial copy of data stored in the disk drive unit; and
~~after the processor has transitioned into the low power mode, a low-power subsystem wirelessly accessing, independent of the CPU,~~ data contained within the shared database of the computing system, ~~via a low-power subsystem.~~ (emphasis added). (Applicant' s claim 1).

The References, however, do not disclose nor suggest the limitation of a system that has a low power subsystem that wirelessly accesses, independent of the CPU, a shared database when the CPU of the computer system is in a low power mode, claimed by applicant. Rather, for example, Barber is limited to disclosing:

[A] notebook computer has two processors, one being very low-powered for extending battery life, the other being very fast for multimedia presentations and heavy number crunching. A user selects a processor appropriate for the intended use. (Barber Summary Of Invention.)

Therefore, in view of applicant' s independent claims including limitations that are not disclosed nor suggested by the References, applicant' s independent claims are patentable over the References.

In addition, the remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims as discussed above, and therefore include similar limitations, and as a result are also patentable over the References.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: November 12, 2004
John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216



12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300